

**Remarks**

Claims 1-4, 6, 11-12, 14-15 and 21-25 are pending. Claims 7-10, 13 and 16-20 are canceled and new Claims 21-25 are added in this Response.

Claim 1 as amended recites a peripheral device inside a firewall communicating a web page requesting configuration information to a web site outside the firewall. In response, the web site through its server communicates a web page with configuration information to the peripheral device. The requesting web page is the "authorization" that allows the responding web page to pass through the firewall. That is to say, absent the requesting web page from the peripheral device, the responding web page would be identified as an unauthorized attempt to access the intranet blocked by the firewall.

Claims 11, 21 and 23 recite similar limitations.

Wiklof (6618162) teaches a printer 18 sending a "wakeup sequence" to a server 28 through the Internet 32. In response, server 28 downloads executable code to printer 18. Wiklof column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 3. Wiklof does not teach any kind of a firewall. Specifically, Wiklof does not teach a printer inside a firewall communicating with a web server outside the firewall. More specifically, Wiklof does not teach a printer inside a firewall sending a requesting web page to a web server outside the firewall to prompt a response so that the communication from the web server will not be blocked by the firewall.

Claim 1, as amended, and its dependent claims, therefore, distinguish patentably over Wiklof. Amended Claim 11 and new Claims 21 and 23, along with their respective dependent claims, also distinguish over Wiklof for these same reasons.

Anderson (6938079) does not appear to supply the claim elements missing from Wiklof. Although the undersigned has not studied Anderson (it is a long patent), a brief review does not disclose any teaching or suggestion that device configuration information is communicated through a firewall generally, and more specifically, that a requesting web page from inside a firewall is used to allow a responding web page to pass through the firewall. Rather, Anderson appears to stand only for the unremarkable proposition that configuration information may be formatted as an XML data stream. Anderson column 46, lines 15-20.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston  
Reg. No. 35,974  
208.433.1991 x204